

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8 and 15-17 are currently being amended. Claims 2 and 7 are amended to improve their form without narrowing their scope. The amendments to claims 1, 8 and 15-17 are clarifying amendments.

This amendment changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-17 remain pending in this application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1-14 and 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0010471 to Lenard (“Lenard”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,752,041 to Fosdick (“Fosdick”). Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Lenard. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a telecommunications platform having a plurality of communications links of which only a portion of the links are enabled for use through the activation of a first base license key, and where each link provides a certain amount of traffic capacity. The telecommunications platform of claim 1 comprises “a licensing framework for activating an upgrade license key to enable additional ones of the plurality of links.” Lenard and Fosdick fail to suggest at least this feature of claim 1.

Lenard is directed to a system for software license balancing in a system with two or more license servers located at different sites (abstract). When the number of software licenses available at one site falls below a predetermined number, and software licenses exist

at an underutilized site, software licenses are transferred to the overutilized site thus balancing the number of software licenses available at each site (abstract).

Lenard, however, fails to disclose any licensing framework for activating an upgrade license key to enable additional ones of a plurality of communication links as recited in claim 1. Lenard merely discloses shifting the number of software licenses between server sites so that enough software licenses are available at high use sites. The number of software licenses at a particular site, however, is not the same as the number of enabled communication links at the site. As clarified in claim 1, each communication link provides a certain amount of traffic capacity. Thus, the number of enabled links determine the total traffic capacity of the telecommunications platform of claim 1. Lenard merely discloses changing the number of software licenses at a site, not its traffic capacity. Thus, Lenard, even if combined with Fosdick, fails to suggest all the features of claim 1.

Fosdick was cited for allegedly disclosing a traffic monitoring element, but fails to cure the deficiencies of Lenard.

Independent claims 8, 15, 16 and 17 respectively recite “activating an upgrade license key to enable additional ones of the plurality of links”, “a licensing framework for activating an upgrade license key to temporarily enable additional ones of the plurality of links”, “a licensing framework for activating an upgrade license key to enable additional ones of the plurality of links”, and “a licensing framework for activating an upgrade license key to enable additional ones of the plurality of links”, and thus are patentable for reasons analogous to claim 1.

The dependent claims are patentable for reasons analogous to their respective independent claims, as well as for further patentable features recited therein. For example, Lenard and Fosdick fail to suggest the features of at least dependent claims 2, 9, or 13, nor would such features have been obvious in light thereof.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance.
Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date June 1, 2006

By Thomas G. Bilodeau

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22879
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,874

Thomas G. Bilodeau
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 43,438